

**10X Office of Products and Programs 10X TTS  
Development, Design, and Research BPA**

# Award Decision Memo

**Reference:** RFQ-1357535

**GSA Contract Number:** GS-35F-523BA

**Task/Call Order:** ID23190013

**Contractor:** Flexion Inc.

1500 W Main Street  
Sun Prairie, WI  
53590

In accordance with FAR 8.405-2(f), this Decision Document details the evaluation and price reasonableness of the quotes received in response to the Request for Quotes for the Office of Products and Programs 10X Initiative Blanket Purchase Agreement (BPA) for Development, Design, and Research.

## Decision Statement

The quote submitted by Flexion Inc. at 1500 W Main Street, Sun Prairie, WI 53590, DUNS Number 942418047, GSA Schedule GS-35F-523BA, represents the best value to the government.

## Period of Performance:

Base Period: August 19, 2019 through August 18, 2020  
Option Year 1: August 19, 2020 through August 18, 2021  
Option Year 2: August 19, 2021 through August 18, 2022  
Option Year 3: August 19, 2022 through August 18, 2023  
Option Year 4: August 19, 2023 through August 18, 2024

1 of 44 General Service

Administration Technology Transformation Services

**PROCUREMENT SENSITIVE INFORMATION - CONFIDENTIAL - DO NOT PUBLISH**

**Government Estimate:** An independent government estimate (IGE) was prepared by Michelle McNellis, from the General Services Administration (GSA) for the estimated labor rates utilizing the acquisition gateway CALC tool. However, the estimated amount over the life of the BPA is \$10,000,000.00.

## Request for Quotation (RFQ)

The requirements described in the RFQ are consistent with the services performed by industries under NAICS Code(s) 541511 – Custom Computer Programming Services with a Business Size Standard of \$27.5 Million.

Market research for this procurement included a Request for Information (RFI) and observation of previous buys similar in scope. The market research conducted assisted in the development of a comprehensive Performance Work Statement (PWS).

This procurement was solicited on March 28, 2019, with an open Questions and Answers period until April 08, 2019.

## Summary

### Analysis:

#### **A. The schedule contracts considered, noting the contractor from which the service was purchased**

GSA released the subject RFQ to GSA Schedule 70 Special Item Number (SIN) 132 51 - Information Technology Professional Services and SIN 70-500 - Order Level Materials (OLM), There were twenty-six ( 26) quoters that responded to the Request for Quote (RFQ) identified below:

#### **Abstract of Quote(s):**

(b) [REDACTED]  
(3)  
(b) (3), (b) (4) [REDACTED]  
(b) (3), [REDACTED]

2 of 44 General Services

Administration Technology Transformation Services  
**PROCUREMENT SENSITIVE INFORMATION - CONFIDENTIAL - DO NOT PUBLISH**

( (b) (3), (b) (4) [REDACTED]  
b  
(b) (3), (b) (4) [REDACTED]

(b) (3), (b) (4)

10 *Flexion* GS-35F-523BA (b) (4)

(b) (3), (b) (4)

(b) (3), (b) (4)

\*Considering this was solicited and will be awarded as a Blanket Purchasing Agreement (BPA), quoters were asked to price labor rates and categories only. However, GSA also required each of the quoters to complete an example pricing tab in order to allow for pricing and discount comparisons between quoters.

\***Note** - One quoter, (b) (3), (b) (4), submitted a response but requested that the Government disregard the quote as the quote submitted was for another TTS RFQ for the Centers of Excellence Discovery opportunity. Therefore, this

quote was no longer considered and the other twenty-five quotes were considered for award.

3 of 44 General Services

Administration Technology Transformation Services

**PROCUREMENT SENSITIVE INFORMATION - CONFIDENTIAL - DO NOT PUBLISH**

## **B. A description of the service purchased**

TTS seeks agile software development services. The services to be provided will include all aspects of the software development process, including initial planning, design, software development and coding, prototyping, documentation, testing, and configuration.

These software development projects will use agile development principles, with necessary documentation, human-centered design, and an extensible infrastructure. TTS expects that the development process will be collaborative and iterative, with open, regular, and frequent communication between TTS and the Contractor. Using [the twelve principles](#) established by the [Agile Manifesto](#) as well as TTS's adoption of [Scrum](#), there are a number of aspects to Agile development that will provide the Government with a project management structure that will ensure contractor performance is monitored and issues are immediately addressed.

Usability testing and other user research methods must be conducted at regular intervals throughout the development process (not just at the beginning or end), with all electronic artifacts from usability testing and/or other research methods with end-users being made available at the end of every applicable sprint.

## **C. The amount paid**

The BPA does not obligate any funds. Funds will be obligated on each call

order.

## **D. The evaluation methodology used in selecting the contractor to receive the order**

The Government evaluated the submitted quotes using Best Value (Trade-offs) considering price and other factors.

4 of 44 General Services

Administration Technology Transformation Services

**PROCUREMENT SENSITIVE INFORMATION CONFIDENTIAL DO NOT PUBLISH**

The Technical Factors when combined were more important than price; however as Non Price ratings became closer, price became more important. The government performed its evaluation of the submitted quote(s) using the following evaluation criteria

**Phase 1 Included:** A. Relevant Experience B Staffing Approach C Usability Research Approach

**Phase 2 Included:**  
D. Oral Interview

**Phase 3**  
**Included:** E.  
Pricing

Quoters were required to meet all requirements in Phase 1 and then assigned a confidence rating After the initial Phase 1 confidence assignment, quoters with a ranking of “Some Confidence” or “High

Confidence” were invited for Phase 2 - Oral Interview(s).

Quotes that failed to meet the criteria established in Phase 1 were no longer considered for award. In turn, quoters that received “Some Confidence” or “High Confidence” in Phase 2 had their price considered in Phase 3, making the final award decision. The criteria for each of the rankings is listed in the Table below:

*Table 1: Criteria for Phase 1*

The Government has "High Confidence" that the Quoter understands the requirement, proposes a sound approach, and will be successful in performing the contract with little or no Government intervention.

The Government has “Some Confidence” that the Quoter understands the requirement, proposes a sound approach, and will be successful in performing the contract with some Government intervention.

5 of 44 General Services

Administration Technology Transformation Services

**PROCUREMENT SENSITIVE INFORMATION - CONFIDENTIAL - DO NOT PUBLISH**

**Low Confidence** The Government has "Low Confidence" that the Quoter understands the requirement, proposes a sound approach, or will be successful in performing the contract even with Government intervention.

In order to assign an overall confidence assessment, quoters were analyzed using “**Pluses**” and “**Minuses**”. See Table 2 below:

*Table 2: Pluses & Minuses*

**Plus (+)** An attribute that, within the context of the evaluation criteria, raises the evaluation above neutral.

**Minus (-)** An attribute that, within the context of the evaluation criteria, reduces the evaluation below neutral.

For each Plus or Minus an evaluator identified in the quotation(s), descriptive language was provided --- to help create a narrative to describe the potential impact of each factor.

The identified Pluses and Minuses created the basis for a narrative and the confidence ratings and were also considered in the trade-off analysis. For example, when two quoters had the same confidence rating (e.g., 'High Confidence') for a non-price factor, the underlying pluses and minuses were reviewed to determine if there was still a meaningful difference between the two quoters for the factor or overall.

## Phase 2 - Oral Interviews

Oral Interviews consisted of the below core questions relative to Phase 1. Each quoter that was invited to Phase 2 received the same questions below: Core questions:

1. We are looking to conduct multiple short-term projects that vary in length, from a couple weeks to several months, depending on the phase. 6 of 44

General Services Administration Technology Transformation Services

**PROCUREMENT SENSITIVE INFORMATION - CONFIDENTIAL - DO NOT PUBLISH**

How would you ensure that you have staff ready for such projects? What is your approach to staff these projects in the event that you do not have staff currently on-hand? 2. 10x projects don't necessarily have set roles and may vary in needs from project to project. What would be your approach for



identifying the proper roles for a project and for staffing those roles to new call orders? 3. Our first phase of projects involves determining if there are any clear reasons not to continue investing in a project. How would you design a research approach to determine if a project is viable? 4. What is your company's approach to cross functional teams? 5. In order to proceed further in our process, many 10x projects need to find one or more partners in the federal government to use and test a functional prototype. What would be your approach for finding such partners, and for scaling a product or service to other agencies? 6. To make the best investment decisions, 10x uses a cross-functional evaluation board. How would you approach the process of evaluating complex technical concepts and translating them in a way to a non-technical audience?

Quoters were then asked to discuss one (1) question tailored to their quote. For a total of seven (7) key questions. Each quoter invited to oral interview was allotted fifty-five (55) minutes. The following table was used to rate Phase 2:

*Table 3: Criteria for Phase 2*

The Government has "High Confidence" that the Quoter understands the requirement, proposes a sound approach, and will be successful in performing the contract with little or no Government intervention.

The Government has "Some Confidence" that the Quoter understands the requirement, proposes a sound approach, and will be successful in performing the contract with some Government intervention.

**Low Confidence** The Government has "Low Confidence" that the Quoter understands the requirement, proposes a sound approach, or will be successful in performing

PROCUREMENT SENSITIVE INFORMATION - CONFIDENTIAL - DO NOT PUBLISH

the contract even with Government intervention.

In order to assign an overall confidence assessment, quoters were analyzed using “**Pluses**” and “**Minuses**”. See Table 2 below:

*Table 4: Pluses & Minuses Phase 2*

**Plus (+)** An attribute that, within the context of the evaluation criteria, raises the evaluation above neutral.

**Minus (-)** An attribute that, within the context of the evaluation criteria, reduces the evaluation below neutral.

## Phase 3 - Price

Finally, pricing was evaluated separately. Each quoter provided labor rates and categories for each labor line item identified in the performance work statement. To compare the prices equally, quoters were instructed to complete an example pricing sheet with pre-filled labor hours in order to get a general idea of the contractor’s proposed pricing and discounts. The anticipated total cost for a base year and four one-year option period(s) was summed to come up with an overall price to compare.

## Technical Evaluation Summary

(b) (3), (b) (5)

8 of 44 General Services Administration Technology Transformation Services

PROCUREMENT SENSITIVE (b) (4), (b) (5)

■

(b) (3), (b) (5)

(b) (3), (b) (5)

(b) (3), (b) (4), (b) (5)

(b) (3), (b) (4), (b) (5)

(b) (3), (b) (4), (b) (5)

(b) (3), (b) (5)

9 **Flexion** *High Confidence High Confidence Some Confidence High Confidence*

(b) (3), (b) (4) (b) (5)

(b) (3), (b) (5)

(b) (3), (b) (4) (b) (5)

(b) (3), (b) (5)

(b) (3), (b) (5)

(b) (3), (b) (5)

6

1

(b) (5)

(b) (3), (b) (5)

(b) (3), (b) (5)

(b) (3), (b) (4) (b) (5)

(b) (3), (b) (4) (b) (5) ce

(b) (3), (b) (5)

(b) (3), (b) (4) (b) (5)

(b) (3), (b) (4) (b) (5)

(b) (3), (b) (4) (b) (5) nce

(b) (3), (b) (4) (b) (5)

(b) (3), (b) (4) (b) (5)

(b) (3), (b) (4) (b) (5)

Administration Technology Transformation Services  
PROCUREMENT SENSITIVE INFORMATION - CONFIDENTIAL - DO NOT PUBLISH

(b) (3), (b) (4) (b) (5)

4 *Flexion* (b) (5)

(b) (3), (b) (4) (b) (5)

(b) (3), (b) (4) (b) (5)

(b) (3), (b) (4) (b) (5)

(b) (3), (b) (4) (b) (5)

(b) (5)

(b) (5)

(b) (3), (b) (4) (b) (5)

(b) (3), (b) (4) (b) (5)

(b) (3), (b) (4) (b) (5)

(b) (3), (b) (4) (b) (5)

(b) (3), (b) (4) (b) (5)

4 *Flexion* (b) (5)

(b) (3), (b) (4) (b) (5)

(b) (3), (b) (4) (b) (5)

(b) (3), (b) (4) (b) (5)

(b) (3), (b) (4) (b) (5)

(b) (5)

(b) (5)

(b) (3), (b) (5)

(b) (3), (b) (4), (b) (5)

## E. The rationale for any tradeoffs in making the selection

10 of 44 General Services

Administration Technology Transformation Services

PROCUREMENT SENSITIVE INFORMATION - CONFIDENTIAL - DO NOT PUBLISH

Trade-off analysis includes both a relative comparison of composite technical ratings and price. Non-price factors were weighted more than price, however price became more important as the non-price factors became more equal. Out of all of the quoters solicited for the requirement on eBuy, there was a high volume of respondents, with twenty-six (26) quote submissions..

Flexion Inc, was found to be amongst the highest rated quoters in Phase 1. Flexion received a “High Confidence” rating in Phase 1 as well as a “High Confidence” rating in Phase 2. The below discussion provides the tradeoff rationale for making the selection of Flexion Inc. as the awardee of the subject requirement.

**Rationale:** Through extensive evaluation, the evaluation team found that the quotes submitted by (b) (3), (b) (4)

“Low Confidence” in terms of Phase 1. Each quoter was

assessed based on findings in terms of composite “Pluses” and “Minuses” extrapolated from their quote. Quoters that received a “Low Confidence” rating in Phase 1 were not considered for Phase 2 - Oral Interviews. The quoters that made it successfully to Phase 2 - Oral Interviews were (b) (3), (b) (4)

each of these eleven (11) companies received a “Some Confidence” or “High Confidence” rating.

**Quoters Rated “Low Confidence” in Phase 1:** (b) (3), (b) (4)

was assessed based on the criteria as stated above, inclusive of relevant experience, staffing approach, and usability research approach. The composite rating for this quoter included consideration of the “Pluses” and “Minuses” found for each evaluation criterion. (b) (3), (b) (4), per the Request for Quote (RFQ), submitted source code samples, a narrative of its experience with open source software development, a staffing plan, and as well as the usability research approach. However, based on the information provided and in consideration of the requirements, (b) (3), (b) (4) was found to have multiple “Minuses” and very few “Pluses” for each of the submission requirements. 11 of 44

General Services Administration Technology Transformation Services

**PROCUREMENT SENSITIVE INFORMATION - CONFIDENTIAL - DO NOT PUBLISH**

(b) (3), (b) (4) receive a “Low Confidence” rating for relevant experience as AMDEX mostly focused on one product it developed for one client. Its documentation was lacking in terms of addressing key functional areas specified in the RFQ. In relation to staffing, (b) (3), (b) (4) went into very minimal detail relative to how it will maintain its staffing throughout performance. AMDEX received a “Some Confidence” rating for only usability and research approach. Based on the information provided, AMDEX received a “Low Confidence” rating overall.

(b) (3), (b) (4) received a “Low Confidence” rating in all three of the evaluation criteria. It submitted several projects for the relevant experience criteria of the RFQ, however only one of those projects complied with the appropriate source code requirements. In addition, as a “Minus” (b) (3), (b) (4) used boilerplate Drupal templates for its source code documentation. Overall when it came to all three of the evaluation criteria, (b) (3), (b) (4) had several “Minuses” to warrant an overall rating of “Low Confidence”.

(b) (3), (b) (4) also received a “Low Confidence” rating for all three (3) evaluation criteria. (b) (3), (b) (4) did not provide access to repositories for source code for relevant experience. (b) (3), (b) (4) did not provide any significant details in relation to its staffing approach. Lastly, (b) (3) presented its usability research approach hypothesis as a solution, rather than a problem to address. Ultimately the evaluation team determined there was a “Low Confidence” (b) (3) will be able to meet the requirements based on the documents provided.

(b) (3), (b) (4) received a “Some Confidence” rating for relevant experience, and “Low Confidence” ratings for both its staffing approach and usability research approach. For experience, (b) (3), (b) (4) submitted some good documentation, but there was little code review pulls in its inventory. For staffing, (b) (3), (b) (4) provided very little detail and did not give the Government a good idea of how its team structure works. Lastly usability research was vague and unclear. Therefore, overall (b) (3), (b) (4) received a “Low Confidence” rating relating to its overall ability to perform this work.

(b) (3), (b) (4) received a “Some Confidence” rating for relevant experience. For experience, (b) (3), (b) (4) had a mix of “pluses” and “minuses” that warranted that rating. (b) (3), (b) (4) received a “Low Confidence” rating for staffing approach and usability research approach. Staffing approach indicated that they only staff for contracts and not permanently. (b) (3), (b) (4) proposed usability

research plan did not align well with 10x practices, as it involved collecting data from all US residents who have applied for disaster-related assistance. It also relied on focus groups, which is not a tactic TTS employs.

(b) (3), (b) (4) requested its quote no longer be considered for the award.

(b) (3), (b) (4) received a “Low Confidence” rating for both relevant

experience and staffing approach. (b) (3), (b) (4) provided no documentation at all for experience or source code samples, and they did not address the pertinent functional areas identified in the requirement. The contractor did not adequately explain its recruiting practices or adhere to the staffing approach page limit. (b) (3), (b) (4) received a “Some Confidence” rating for the usability research approach. Its Hypothesis was a good problem statement because it took on a very human-centered approach and provided a tech solution. However a few items in the usability approach were unclear. Overall (b) (3), (b) (4) receives a “Low Confidence” rating based on the documents received.

(b) (3), (b) (4) received a “Low Confidence” rating for relevant experience and usability research approach. For staffing approach, the quoter received a “Some Confidence” rating. The government does not have confidence in the quoter’s source code as the government’s technical experts were not able to access it. Also, the government does not have confidence in the quoter’s usability research approach as it does not have ideal practices for recruiting participants. For these reasons, (b) (3), (b) (4) received a “Low Confidence” rating for Phase One.

(b) (3), (b) (4) received a “Low Confidence” rating for relevant experience, staffing approach, and usability research approach. The government does not have confidence that the vendor relies on subcontractors for staffing as 10x prefers to work with the same engineers throughout the project. Also, the government does not believe that (b) (3), (b) (4) usability research approach aligns with the practices and expectations of the government. For these reasons, (b) (3), (b) (4) received a “Low Confidence” rating in Phase One.

(b) (3), (b) (4) received a “Low Confidence” rating for relevant experience and staffing approach, and received a “Some Confidence” rating for its usability research approach. The government does not believe that the quoter’s usability



research approach aligns with the government's preferred approach. Overall, major issues were found in (b) (3), (b) (4) quote. For example, there was little to no details about CI/CD, deployment, testing, as stated in the RFQ paragraph 3.2.1. It was also unclear how the quoter planned on staffing the requirement or any details in relation to its onboarding. And finally, the usability approach was very fragmented in how it planned on addressing the issue and they relied too much on focus groups. For these reasons, (b) (3), (b) (4) received a "Low Confidence" rating for Phase One.

(b) (3), (b) (4) received a "Low Confidence" rating for relevant experience, staffing approach, and usability research approach. The government does not have confidence in the quoter's usability research approach as it involves a lot of advanced technologies that do not seem to make sense in the process, and is not customer focused. For these reasons, (b) (3), (b) (4) received a "Low Confidence" rating for Phase One.

(b) (3), (b) (4) received a "Low Confidence" rating for relevant experience and staffing approach, and received a "Some Confidence" rating for its usability research approach. The usability research approach is not performed in accordance with government requirements for this contract. Additionally, its staffing approach is unclear and the government does not have confidence that (b) (3), (b) (4) can fulfill its staffing needs. For these reasons, the quoter received a "Low Confidence" rating for Phase One.

(b) (3), (b) (4) received a "Low Confidence" rating for relevant experience, staffing approach, and usability research approach. The government does not have confidence that the quoter understands the requirements since they rely on subcontractors for staffing as 10x prefers to work with the same engineers throughout the project. Also, the government does not prefer to rely on focus groups for usability research, and prefers to have usability research throughout the project instead of once at the beginning. For these reasons, the (b) (3), (b) (4) received a "Low Confidence" for Phase One.

(b) (3), (b) (4) received a "Low Confidence" rating for Relevant Experience and Staffing Approach, while it received a "Some Confidence" rating for its

Usability Research Approach. The government did not have confidence that (b) (3), (b) (4) Usability Research Approach was of good quality and could

14 of 44 General Services

Administration Technology Transformation Services

**PROCUREMENT SENSITIVE INFORMATION - CONFIDENTIAL - DO NOT PUBLISH**

not determine the amount of staff on hand or its staffing approach. For these reasons, (b) (3), (b) (4) received a “Low Confidence” rating for Phase One.

(b) (3), (b) (4) received a “Low Confidence” rating for Relevant Experience and Staffing Approach, and it received a “Some Confidence” rating for its Usability Research Approach. The government could not confirm the source code quality for this company, and is not confident in its staffing ability. Overall, (b) (3), (b) (4) received a rating of “Low Confidence” for Phase One.

The quotes provided by (b) (3), (b) (4) contained mostly “Minuses” and were all considered “Low Confidence” overall with either none or very few “Pluses” to warrant a higher rating. Therefore, none of these quoters were invited to participate in Phase 2 for oral interviews.

**Quoters Rated “Some Confidence” or “High Confidence”:** There were eleven quoters, that received a “Some Confidence” or “High Confidence” rating in Phase 1. These quoters were, (b) (3), (b) (4)

(b) (3), (b) (4) All eleven of these quoters were invited to participate in Phase 2 of the evaluation process. Below is a summary of each of their evaluations for Phase 1 and Phase 2.

(b) (3), (b) (4) received an overall “High Confidence” rating in Phase 1.

Under Phase (b) (3), (b) (4) received multiple “Pluses” for relevant experience. (b) (3) provided strong documentation throughout the repository examples requested, demonstrated clear, standard use of project management features and robust testing across the repositories. Furthermore, (b) (3), (b) (4) provide recent and relevant projects as defined in the RFQ with examples of all the requested functional areas identified within the relevant experience criteria (b) (3), (b) (4) received an overall “High Confidence” rating for relevant experience.

15 of 44 General Services

Administration Technology Transformation Services

**PROCUREMENT SENSITIVE INFORMATION - CONFIDENTIAL - DO NOT PUBLISH**

In terms of Staffing Approach, (b) (3), (b) (4) provided the Government the amount of staff it currently has on hand, it described its “specialty teams” which focused specifically on short-term government work designed to uncover user needs, and descriptions of actual roles for projects. (b) (3), (b) (4) received an overall “High Confidence” rating for its staffing approach.

Lastly, the Usability Research Approach emphasized the importance of cross-functional teams, the importance of building for user needs, and provided a hypothesis focused on digital “interaction portal”, and didn’t simply jump to specific solution. (b) (3), (b) (4) received an overall “High Confidence” rating for its usability research approach. (b) (3), (b) (4) received an overall “High Confidence” rating for Phase 1 with “High Confidence” in all three evaluation criteria.

In Phase 2 for oral interviews, (b) (3), (b) (4) was asked to prepare for seven (7) questions as part of the oral interview. All questions and the interview agenda were submitted in advance to (b) (3), (b) (4). The seventh question was relative to its quote.

For the first question, (b) (3), (b) (4) was asked how it would ensure that they have staff ready for multi-phase projects. As well as what their approach would be to staff these projects in the event that they did not have the staff currently on-hand. (b) (3), (b) (4) answers contained all “Pluses” in relation to this question,

resulting in an overall “High Confidence” rating for question 1. Question 2, (b) (3), (b) (3) was asked what its approach would be for identifying the proper roles for a project and for staffing those roles. For this question (b) (3), (b) (3) received all pluses for its response, resulting in an overall “High Confidence” rating for question 2. Question 3, it was asked how it would design a research approach to determine if a project is viable. (b) (3), (b) (3) response was detailed in how it explained its experience in determining project viability as well as its process. Overall there were all pluses for question 3, resulting in a rating of “High Confidence”.

In relation to the 4th question, (b) (3), (b) (3) was asked about their approach to cross functional teams. (b) (3), (b) (3) described in detail, how it finds high-performing generalists, great communicators who are excited to collaborate, hire personnel who are excited about government innovation, and Building a collaborative environment. (b) (3), (b) (3) received a “High Confidence” rating for question 4.

16 of 44 General Services

Administration Technology Transformation Services

**PROCUREMENT SENSITIVE INFORMATION - CONFIDENTIAL - DO NOT PUBLISH**

Question 5, (b) (3), (b) (3) addressed how it intends on finding partners in the federal government in order to use and test prototypes. (b) (3), (b) (3) received multiple pluses from both evaluators based on the details and examples explained, resulting in a “High Confidence” rating for question 5. Question 6, (b) (3), (b) (3) received a “Some Confidence” rating. Although receiving multiple pluses for question 6, it appeared that (b) (3), (b) (3) was too technical in its answer, they stated how they would write technical specs and look at existing solutions, when 10X requires more creativity on this front.

Lastly, for question 7, (b) (3), (b) (3) was asked a custom question relative to its quote. For question 7, (b) (3), (b) (3) was asked to address the fact that they only had one content strategist and one data scientist listed for current employees, and to address the concern of if 10x requested these skills, how quickly would they be able to meet these needs. (b) (3), (b) (3) addressed these concerns by explaining they have a continuous hiring pipeline with candidate ready to hire. (b) (3), (b) (3) also

exclaimed that they have partnerships with other companies that have content strategy and data and analytics personnel at the ready. (b) (3), (b) (4) received a "High Confidence" for question 7. Based on its answers, (b) (3), (b) (4) received an overall "High Confidence" rating for Phase 2.

(b) (3), (b) (4) received an overall "High Confidence" rating in Phase 1. Under Phase 1, (b) (3), (b) (4) received some "Pluses" for relevant experience. (b) (3), (b) (4) provided a good pool of source code examples while mostly addressing the requested functional areas identified in the RFQ. There were a few "minuses" in relation to how (b) (3), (b) (4) addressed prototyping, testing, and deployment of code. There were also issues identified in relation to the examples provided being very reliant on Drupal, with limited other options for development. (b) (3), (b) (4) received an overall "Some Confidence" rating for relevant experience.

In terms of Staffing Approach, (b) (3), (b) (4) demonstrated good connections with agile and open-source communities and provided information confirming that it employs a team of over fifty (50) software developers, designers, UX specialists, and DevOps engineers, which is a good mix of skill sets. (b) (3), (b) (4) was thorough and detailed in its staffing plan resulting in (b) (3), (b) (4) receiving an overall "High Confidence" rating for its staffing approach.

17 of 44 General Services

Administration Technology Transformation Services

**PROCUREMENT SENSITIVE INFORMATION - CONFIDENTIAL - DO NOT PUBLISH**

Lastly, the Usability Research Approach emphasized the importance of partnering with an agency to access disaster victims, included many recommended forms of user research, and focused on diversity of test users. (b) (3), (b) (4) received an overall "High Confidence" rating for its usability research approach. (b) (3), (b) (4) received an overall "High Confidence" rating for Phase 1 with "High Confidence" in two out of the three evaluation criteria.

In Phase 2 for oral interviews, (b) (3), (b) (4) was asked to prepare for seven (7)

questions as part of the oral interview. All questions and the interview agenda were submitted in advance to (b) (3), (b) (4) The seventh question was relative to its quote.

For the first question, (b) (3), (b) (4) was asked how it would ensure that they have staff ready for multi-phase projects. As well as what their approach would be to staff these projects in the event that they did not have the staff currently on-hand. (b) (3), (b) (4) answers contained all “Pluses” in relation to this question, resulting in an overall “High Confidence” rating for question 1.

(b) (3), (b) (4) discussed how it would sit down with product owner, learn desired outcomes and scope, work backwards from there and focus its staffing approach around “flexibility and agility”. Question 2, (b) (3), (b) (4) was asked what its approach would be for identifying the proper roles for a project and for staffing those roles. For this question (b) (3), (b) (4) received all pluses for its response, resulting in an overall “High Confidence” rating for question 2. (b) (3), (b) (4) went into detail in relation to cross-functional work, fulfilling roles with multiple service areas, and focus on human-centered design with projects getting a dedicated researcher

Question 3, (b) (3), (b) (4) was asked how it would design a research approach to determine if a project is viable. (b) (3), (b) (4) provided a strong response, specifying how they utilize an impact scorecard and look at regulatory and compliance constraints when deciding if a project is viable. Overall there were all pluses for question 3, resulting in a rating of “High Confidence” for question 3.

In relation to the 4th question, (b) (3), (b) (4) was asked about their approach to cross functional teams. (b) (3), (b) (4) emphasized a focus on professional development, team charters, and utilizing DevOps as a practice, and not just a

tool. These examples were a strong example of how (b) (3), (b) (4) would approach cross-functionality. (b) (3), (b) (4) received a “High Confidence” rating for question 4. For Question 5, (b) (3), (b) (4) addressed how it intends on finding

partners in the federal government in order to use and test prototypes.

(b) (3), (b) (4) received multiple pluses from both evaluators based on the details and examples explained, resulting in a “High Confidence rating for question 5.

(b) (3), (b) (4) identified multiple methods, ways in which it would find a willing partner, as well as how it intended on scaling once a way forward is identified. Question 6, (b) (3), (b) (4) received a “Some Confidence” rating. Although receiving multiple pluses for question 6, it appeared that (b) (3), (b) (4) failed to provide real life examples of how they have approached this problem.

Lastly, for question 7, (b) (3), (b) (4) was asked a custom question relative to its quote. For question 7, (b) (3), (b) (4) was asked to address their use of Drupal and beyond. (b) (3), (b) (4) addressed these items by explaining their firm began as drupal consultancy, but it's less than half of their business currently. (b) (3), (b) (4) also exclaimed that they now do a variety of pure front-end projects. (b) (3), (b) (4) received a “High Confidence” for question 7. Based on its answers, (b) (3), (b) (4) received an overall “High Confidence” rating for Phase 2.

(b) (3), (b) (4) received an overall “High Confidence” rating in Phase 1. Under Phase 1, (b) (3), (b) (4) received several “Pluses” for relevant experience. (b) (3), (b) (4) provided source code projects that demonstrated experience across multiple programming languages. In addition, (b) (3), (b) (4) did a good job at tailoring their project examples to be relevant to the 10x process. (b) (3), (b) (4) received an overall “High Confidence” rating for relevant experience.

In terms of Staffing Approach, (b) (3), (b) (4) discussed how it intended on providing dedicated personnel to be in charge of managing the BPA and details in terms of other staff they have on hand. (b) (3), (b) (4) also provided a staffing plan that greatly reflected the skill sets required to support 10x's phased infrastructure. (b) (3), (b) (4) was thorough and detailed in its staffing plan resulting in (b) (3), (b) (4) receiving an overall “High Confidence” rating for its staffing approach.

Lastly, (b) (3), (b) (4) Usability Research Approach response had some noted minuses as well as a few pluses. In the plan (b) (3), (b) (4) discussed how it planned to develop user personas before interviewing candidates and there were few 19 of

details on how they will recruit users. (b) (3), (b) (4) received an overall “Some Confidence” rating for its usability research approach. (b) (3), (b) (4) received an overall “High Confidence” rating for Phase 1 with "High Confidence" in two out of the three evaluation criteria.

In Phase 2 for oral interviews, (b) (3), (b) (4) was asked to prepare for seven (7) questions as part of the oral interview. All questions and the interview agenda were submitted in advance to (b) (3), (b) (4). The seventh question was relative to its quote.

For the first question, (b) (3), (b) (4) was asked how it would ensure that they have staff ready for multi-phase projects. As well as what their approach would be to staff these projects in the event that they did not have the staff currently on-hand. (b) (3), (b) (4) answers contained some “Pluses” and some “Minuses” in relation to this question, resulting in an overall “Some Confidence” rating for question 1. Some of the responses provided by (b) (3), (b) (4) in relation to question 1 were unclear, resulting in the “Some Confidence” rating. Question 2, (b) (3), (b) (4) was asked what its approach would be for identifying the proper roles for a project and for staffing those roles. For this question (b) (3), (b) (4) received several “Pluses” but also failed to go into detail about how it intended on identifying roles between different pools of available staffing, lowering the Government’s overall confidence. (b) (3), (b) (4) received a “Some” Confidence rating for question 2.

Question 3, (b) (3), (b) (4) was asked how it would design a research approach to determine if a project is viable. (b) (3), (b) (4) provided a strong response, specifying how they intended on asking the right questions and making their overall goals clear. Overall there were all pluses for question 3, resulting in a rating of “High Confidence”.

In relation to the 4th question, (b) (3), (b) (4) was asked about their approach to cross functional teams. (b) (3), (b) (4) emphasized a focus on communication, understanding others’ positions, and ownership of success. These responses were a strong example of how (b) (3), (b) (4) would approach cross-functionality. (b) (3), (b) (4) received a “High Confidence” rating for question 4.

For Question 5, (b) (3), (b) (4) had to address how it intends on finding partners in the



federal government in order to use and test prototypes. (b) (3), (b) (4) had some 20 of

44

General Services Administration Technology Transformation Services  
**PROCUREMENT SENSITIVE INFORMATION - CONFIDENTIAL - DO NOT PUBLISH**

neutral or “Minus” responses but also received multiple pluses from both evaluators, resulting in a “Some Confidence” rating for question 5 overall. One example of a minus was (b) (3), (b) (4) talked a lot about leveraging the 18F network, but did not explain how that was going to happen. Question 6, (b) (3), (b) (4) received a “High Confidence” rating. (b) (3), (b) (4) received all pluses for question 6, it provided great detail in terms of how it would approach the process of evaluating complex technical concepts and translating them in a way to a non-technical audience. One good example is how (b) (3), (b) (4) discussed its process for a design sprint where they bring everybody into the room, even if they are a different skill set to discuss a topic.

Lastly, for question 7, (b) (3), (b) (4) was asked a custom question relative to its quote. For question 7, (b) (3), (b) (4) was asked to discuss teaming arrangements and how they will work. (b) (3), (b) (4) did not explain how having different companies and freelancers on the contract will affect the teaming arrangement or go into much detail about how their arrangements will work. (b) (3), (b) (4) received a “Some Confidence” for question 7. Based on its answers, (b) (3), (b) (4) received an overall “Some Confidence” rating for Phase 2.

(b) (3), (b) (4) received an overall “Some Confidence” rating in Phase 1. Under Phase 1, (b) (3), (b) (4) did not provide access to its source code repositories for relevant experience. They did appear to address the relevant functional areas in the RFQ but there was also a heavy emphasis on Drupal, in which options for development are limited. However, there was a good demonstration of their strength in visual design. (b) (3), (b) (4) received an overall “Some Confidence” rating for relevant experience.

In terms of Staffing Approach, (b) (3), (b) (4) discussed how it intended on recruiting and maintaining a workforce. (b) (3), (b) (4) has a preference for full-time staff, rather than subcontracting out to other quoters. They also have over one-hundred (100) staff on-hand. (b) (3), (b) (4) also discussed the pertinent skills of the staff on-hand that proved to be relevant to 10x. (b) (3), (b) (4) was thorough

and detailed in its staffing plan resulting in (b) (3), (b) (4) receiving an overall “High Confidence” rating for its staffing approach.

Lastly, the Usability Research Approach (b) (3), (b) (4) response had a major flaw in that its approach didn’t involve interacting with users until the end of their 21 of

44

General Services Administration Technology Transformation Services  
**PROCUREMENT SENSITIVE INFORMATION - CONFIDENTIAL - DO NOT PUBLISH**

research plan, this is fundamentally flawed in terms of how 10x functions. (b) (3), (b) (4) received an overall “Some Confidence” rating for its usability research approach. (b) (3), (b) (4) received an overall “Some Confidence” rating for Phase 1 with “High Confidence” in only one out of the three evaluation criteria.

In Phase 2 for oral interviews, (b) (3), (b) (4) was asked to prepare for seven (7) questions as part of the oral interview. All questions and the interview agenda were submitted in advance to (b) (3), (b) (4). The seventh question was relative to its quote.

For the first question, (b) (3), (b) (4) was asked how it would ensure that they have staff ready for multi-phase projects. As well as what their approach would be to staff these projects in the event that they did not have the staff currently on-hand. (b) (3), (b) (4) answers contained some “Pluses” and some “Minuses” in relation to this question, resulting in an overall “Some Confidence” rating for question 1. An example minus was that (b) (3), (b) (4) stated that all their staff are only part-time on multiple projects. This made the Government question how (b) (3), (b) (4) would address context switching. Overall (b) (3), (b) (4) received a “Some Confidence” rating for question 1. Question 2, (b) (3), (b) (4) was asked what its approach would be for identifying the proper roles for a project and for staffing those roles. For this question (b) (3), (b) (4) received several “Minuses” by failing to demonstrate an understanding of the technical specs or how the program goals align with technical requirements. This greatly lowered the Government’s overall confidence. (b) (3), (b) (4) received a “Low” Confidence rating for question 2.

Question 3, (b) (3), (b) (4) was asked how it would design a research approach to determine if a project is viable. (b) (3), (b) (4) provided a strong response,

discussing how they focus on understand the goals and KPIs, conducting interviews, and doing the right technical research. Overall there were all pluses for question 3, resulting in a rating of “High Confidence”.

In relation to the 4th question, (b) (3), (b) (4) was asked about their approach to cross functional teams. Again (b) (3), (b) (4) failed to address context switching by re-emphasizing how their staff are already split across projects. There were some “pluses” relative to discussing how their Agile methodology demands cross-functionality and emphasizing a focus on transparency. (b) (3), (b) (4) received a “Some Confidence” rating for question 4.

22 of 44 General Services

Administration Technology Transformation Services

**PROCUREMENT SENSITIVE INFORMATION - CONFIDENTIAL - DO NOT PUBLISH**

For Question 5, (b) (3), (b) (4) had to address how it intends on finding partners in the federal government in order to use and test prototypes. (b) (3), (b) (4) had many good ideas in terms of how to address this issue, inclusive of starting with the agency in which the idea originated, and then looking for other agencies with similar missions. (b) (3), (b) (4) received multiple pluses from both evaluators based on the details and examples explained, resulting in a “High Confidence” rating for question 5. Question 6, (b) (3), (b) (4) received a “Some Confidence” rating. (b) (3), (b) (4) was asked to discuss its approach in regards to evaluating complex technical concepts and translating them for non-technical people. (b) (3), (b) (4) received some pluses for question 6, but notably failed to discuss any examples from quoter work provided how they do this.

Lastly, for question 7, (b) (3), (b) (4) was asked a custom question relative to its quote. For question 7, (b) (3), (b) (4) was asked to discuss its heavy focus on Drupal and site redesign and whether it had experience with projects beyond that. (b) (3), (b) (4) did not explain how it would go beyond site design or Drupal. Based on the answers provided it did not appear that (b) (3), (b) (4) had a wide enough array of experience to meet the demands of 10x. (b) (3), (b) (4) received a “Low Confidence” for question 7. Based on its answers, (b) (3), (b) (4) received an overall “Some Confidence” rating for Phase 2.

(b) (3), (b) (4) received an overall "Some Confidence" rating in Phase 1. Under Phase 1, (b) (3), (b) (4) received several "Pluses" and a few "Minuses" for relevant experience.

(b) (3), (b) (4) source code projects demonstrated consistency in style across repositories and demonstrated the use of continuous integration services and indicators of project health. (b) (3), (b) (4) addressed the required functional areas however, one thing the evaluation team found that (b) (3), (b) (4) described more waterfall sprints as opposed to agile. (b) (3), (b) (4) received an overall "Some Confidence" rating for relevant experience.

In terms of Staffing Approach, (b) (3), (b) (4) was not very clear in terms of how long it takes to onboard personnel, there was a good emphasis on hiring personnel with an open-source background, but they also stated they only have about thirty-two (32) people on staff total with no clear indication of what the

23 of 44

General Services Administration Technology Transformation Services

**PROCUREMENT SENSITIVE INFORMATION - CONFIDENTIAL - DO NOT PUBLISH**

skill sets of those personnel are. As there wasn't a ton of detail in its staffing plan, the Government's overall confidence in the quoter's abilities were lowered, resulting in (b) (3), (b) (4) receiving an overall "Some Confidence" rating for its staffing approach.

Lastly, the Usability Research Approach, (b) (3), (b) (4) response had a couple minuses. The plan was not particularly well-communicated and described jumping to solutions without waiting for research results. (b) (3), (b) (4) did do a good job at emphasizing users and testing. (b) (3), (b) (4) received an overall "Some Confidence" rating for its usability research approach. (b) (3), (b) (4) received an overall "Some Confidence" rating for Phase 1 with three "Some Confidence" ratings in all three of the evaluation criteria.

In Phase 2 for oral interviews, (b) (3), (b) (4) was asked to prepare for seven (7) questions as part of the oral interview. All questions and the interview agenda were submitted in advance to (b) (3), (b) (4). The seventh question was relative to its quote.

For the first question, (b) (3), (b) (4) was asked how it would ensure that they have staff ready for multi-phase projects. As well as what their approach would be to staff these projects in the event that they did not have the staff currently on-hand.

(b) (3), (b) (4) answers contained some “Pluses” in relation to this question, but the biggest concern found by the Government was that (b) (3), (b) (4) answer was too focused on hiring and not on strategy for existing personnel or on its staffing approach, resulting in an overall “Some Confidence” rating for question 1.

Question 2, (b) (3), (b) (4) was asked what its approach would be for identifying the proper roles for a project and for staffing those roles. For this question (b) (3), (b) (4) received several “Pluses” but also was discussing non-relevant talking points such as Machine Learning and discussing the use of “design sprints” that seem to be focused on resolving a technical plan, it was not clear whether this included non-technical tasks. (b) (3), (b) (4) received a “Some” Confidence rating for question 2.

Question 3, (b) (3), (b) (4) was asked how it would design a research approach to determine if a project is viable. (b) (3), (b) (4) did not provide a very strong response, they spoke to how they would discuss project viability with Agency

24 of 44 General Services

Administration Technology Transformation Services

**PROCUREMENT SENSITIVE INFORMATION - CONFIDENTIAL - DO NOT PUBLISH**

heads, which is typically much further down the project pipeline. Overall there were some concerns based on the answers provided for question 3, resulting in a rating of “Some Confidence”.

In relation to the 4th question, (b) (3), (b) (4) was asked about their approach to cross functional teams. Healthstar emphasized a focus on maximizing flexibility, providing personnel the flexibility to change roles when it makes sense, and discussed the fact that their design and development teams work together. These responses were a strong example of how (b) (3), (b) (4) would approach

cross-functionality. (b) (3), (b) (4) received a “High Confidence” rating for question 4.

For Question 5, (b) (3), (b) (4) had to address how it intends on finding partners in the federal government in order to use and test prototypes. (b) (3), (b) (4) had some very strong responses to this question receiving multiple “Pluses”. They discussed that they utilize the same approach as their recruitment practices to find agency partners. They also mentioned that they focus on talking to other agencies with similar pain points. Lastly, (b) (3), (b) (4) provided a concise answer in terms of how they reach out to agencies or partners to get more agency involvement. (b) (3), (b) (4) received a “High Confidence” rating for question 5 overall. Question 6, (b) (3), (b) (4) received a “Some Confidence” rating. (b) (3), (b) (4) received varying “Pluses”, “Minuses”, and some neutrals for this question. (b) (3), (b) (4) answer was mostly ambiguous, the evaluation board believed it appeared they focused almost entirely on *Not* talking about tech rather than translating the key-points to a non-technical audience. This lowered the Government's confidence in terms of (b) (3), (b) (4) approach the process of evaluating complex technical concepts and translating them in a way to a non-technical audience.

Lastly, for question 7, (b) (3), (b) (4) was asked a custom question relative to its quote. For question 7, (b) (3), (b) (4) was asked to discuss if they have any other offerings outside of engineering. In this regard, (b) (3), (b) (4) didn't really answer the question. The answer was ambiguous with statements about projects started by them being heavily feature-based as opposed to human centered-design based. (b) (3), (b) (4) received a “Low Confidence” rating for question 7. Based on its answers, (b) (3), (b) (4) received an overall “Some Confidence” rating for Phase 2.

(b) (3), (b) (4) received an overall “Some Confidence” rating in Phase 1, (b) (3), (b) (4) did not provide access to its source code repositories for relevant experience. There were several notable “Minuses” such as sloppy formatting, and their product approach was very tool-centric rather than process-focused.

(b) (3), (b) (4) did however address the appropriate amount of functional project areas. (b) (3), (b) (4) received an overall “Some Confidence” rating for relevant experience.

In terms of Staffing Approach, (b) (3), (b) (4) was not very clear nor did it provide much detail in terms of multi-talent or cross-functionality in its staffing approach. They were also missing some key skill sets required for the BPA such as visual or content design. They also did not really address what the typical team makeup looks like. (b) (3), (b) (4) did however do a good job in terms of demonstrating how it has built a strong pipeline of agile government projects. Considering there was a lack of detail in its staffing plan, the Government’s overall confidence in the quoter’s abilities were lowered, resulting in (b) (3), (b) (4) receiving an overall “Some Confidence” rating for its staffing approach.

Lastly, the Usability Research Approach, (b) (3), (b) (4) response had several “Pluses”. The plan had a strong recruitment plan, discussed how early prototyping is a good way to get user feedback, and they made use of multiple research methods. (b) (3), (b) (4) received an overall “High Confidence” rating for its usability research approach. (b) (3), (b) (4) received an overall “Some Confidence” rating for Phase 1 with two “Some Confidence” ratings and one “High Confidence” rating out of the three evaluation criteria.

In Phase 2 for oral interviews, (b) (3), (b) (4) was asked to prepare for seven (7) questions as part of the oral interview. All questions and the interview agenda were submitted in advance to (b) (3), (b) (4). The seventh question was relative to its quote.

For the first question, (b) (3), (b) (4) was asked how it would ensure that they have staff ready for multi-phase projects. As well as what their approach would be to staff these projects in the event that they did not have the staff currently on-hand.

(b) (3), (b) (4) answers contained several “Pluses” in relation to this question with no “Minuses”. (b) (3), (b) (4) did a good job in terms of describing their history of 26 of 44

staffing with public and commercial projects similar in scope and also utilize recruiting agencies to provide pre-screened candidates. (b) (3), (b) (4) received an overall “High Confidence” rating for question 1. Question 2, (b) (3), (b) (4) was asked what its approach would be for identifying the proper roles for a project and for staffing those roles. For this question (b) (3), (b) (4) discussed how it intended on assessing the available technologies, skills, and Key Performance Indicators (KPIs) at the beginning of the project. This widely not a standard practice in terms of how 10x operates. Although, (b) (3), (b) (4) also received some “Pluses” as well, the concern of how it intended on operating the program of technology assessments lowered the Government’s confidence in the quoter. (b) (3), (b) (4) received a “Some” Confidence rating for question 2.

Question 3, (b) (3), (b) (4) was asked how it would design a research approach to determine if a project is viable. (b) (3), (b) (4) answer indicated that its approach was very similar to 10x’s approach, they also informed the Government that they pay attention to analytics and stress talking to users. This was a strong response in terms of being in alignment with 10x and the requirements specified in the RFQ. Overall there were no “Minuses” for question 3, and based on the answers provided, (b) (3), (b) (4) received a rating of “High Confidence”.

In relation to the 4th question, (b) (3), (b) (4) was asked about their approach to cross functional teams. A major concern was that (b) (3), (b) (4), didn’t really answer the question, they also explained they had four project managers on one project, these are not good indicators of a high performing cross-functional team. They did have some “pluses” especially in relation to team coverage, training in agile, and ability to quickly address “hot items” or customer concerns. However with responses somewhat lacking or even concerning, (b) (3), (b) (4) received a “Some Confidence” rating for question 4.

For Question 5, (b) (3), (b) (4) had to address how it intends on finding partners in the federal government in order to use and test prototypes. The majority of (b) (3), (b) (4) responses were neutral, with no “Pluses” identified. There was a major “Minus” however in how (b) (3), (b) (4) described how it prefers to invest in the latest technology when trying to bring a product to the market. This is not always a viable option for the 10x team of GSA as a whole. (b) (3), (b) (4) received a “Low Confidence” rating for question 5 overall.



Question 6, (b) (3), (b) (4) received a “Some Confidence” rating. (b) (3), (b) (4) received varying “Pluses”, “Minuses”, and some neutrals for this question. However, (b) (3), (b) (4) answers were mostly ambiguous, with no examples provided. This lowered the Government's confidence in terms of (b) (3), (b) (4) approach to the process of evaluating complex technical concepts and translating them in a way to a non-technical audience.

Lastly, for question 7, (b) (3), (b) (4) was asked a custom question relative to its quote. For question 7, (b) (3), (b) (4) was asked to discuss its UX, visual, and content strategists on-hand. (b) (3), (b) (4) failed to discuss it's content strategist it had on-hand. They also discussed how they sometimes use designer experience to stand in for user research when it's not available. This approach is unacceptable to 10x. (b) (3), (b) (4) received a “Low Confidence” rating for question 7. Based on its answers, (b) (3), (b) (4) received an overall “Some Confidence” rating for Phase 2.

(b) (3), (b) (4) received an overall “High Confidence” rating in Phase 1. Under Phase 1 (b) (3), (b) (4) received some “Pluses” and some “Minuses” for it's documents relating to relevant experience. (b) (3), (b) (4) did not provide access to approximately 1/6 of its source code repositories however it still demonstrated a clear mapping relating to the requested functional areas identified in the RFQ. However, there were still multiple “Pluses” and enough detail to warrant a “High Confidence” rating for relevant experience.

In terms of Staffing Approach, (b) (3), (b) (4) discussed in detail how its time from first contact with a potential employee, to making an offer is 35 days--the government is confident that this is an acceptable timeline. (b) (3), (b) (4) also emphasized diversity and inclusion in its hiring processes, which is in alignment with TTS as a whole. Lastly, (b) (3), (b) (4) discussed it is a growing team of about sixty-eight (68) full-time employees, with core capabilities across the requested

functional areas including user research, design, product, program and delivery management, and engineering. (b) (3), (b) (4) was thorough and detailed in its staffing plan resulting in (b) (3), (b) (4) receiving an overall “High Confidence” rating for its staffing approach.

(b) (3), (b) (4) Usability Research Approach demonstrated how their firm is already in sprint-planning mode. They also discussed early prototyping, which is a good way to make research actionable. Overall, (b) (3), (b) (4) approach was strong based

28 of 44 General Services

Administration Technology Transformation Services

**PROCUREMENT SENSITIVE INFORMATION - CONFIDENTIAL - DO NOT PUBLISH**

on its response. (b) (3), (b) (4) received an overall “High Confidence” rating for its usability research approach. (b) (3), (b) (4) received an overall “High Confidence” rating for Phase 1 with "High Confidence" ratings in all three evaluation criteria.

In Phase 2 for oral interviews, (b) (3), (b) (4) was asked to prepare for seven (7) questions as part of the oral interview. All questions and the interview agenda were submitted in advance to (b) (3), (b) (4). The seventh question was relative to its quote.

For the first question (b) (3), (b) (4) was asked how it would ensure that they have staff ready for multi-phase projects. As well as what their approach would be to staff these projects in the event that they did not have the staff currently on-hand.

(b) (3), (b) (4) answers contained several “Pluses”, but also some “Minuses” in relation to this question, resulting in an overall “Some Confidence” rating for question 1. Specifically, (b) (3), (b) (4) stressed its abilities in terms of hiring, but not necessarily on the staff it has on-hand. There were however some strong responses, for example how (b) (3), (b) (4) stated they have a new talent director that was brought onboard to bring all recruiting in-house. Question 2 (b) (3), (b) (4) was asked what its approach would be for identifying the proper roles for a project and for staffing those roles. For this question (b) (3), (b) (4) received all pluses for its response, resulting in an overall “High Confidence” rating for question 2. (b) (3), (b) (4) went into detail in

how it is currently planning ahead for what 10x projects might look like and their current bench has 3-6 people at any one time.

Question 3, (b) (3), (b) (4) was asked how it would design a research approach to determine if a project is viable. (b) (3), (b) (4) provided a strong response in relation to problem identification. They went into great detail how they would narrow in on problem statement with stakeholders, working closely with the stakeholders to ensure it's something GSA should be working on, and looking at quantitative data. Overall there were all pluses for question 3, resulting in an overall rating of "High Confidence" for this question.

In relation to the 4th question, (b) (3), (b) (4) was asked about their approach to cross functional teams. (b) (3), (b) (4) emphasized a focus on product vision, utilizing policy subject-matter experts, and a key focus on user research and feedback. These examples were a strong example of how (b) (3), (b) (4) would approach cross-functionality. (b) (3), (b) (4) received a "High Confidence" rating for question 4.

29 of 44 General Services

Administration Technology Transformation Services

**PROCUREMENT SENSITIVE INFORMATION - CONFIDENTIAL - DO NOT PUBLISH**

For Question 5, (b) (3), (b) (4) was unique in that it discussed how it would work with stakeholders to identify the perfect partner. They also address some interesting and unique scaling solutions. (b) (3), (b) (4) received all pluses from both evaluators based on the details and examples explained, resulting in a "High Confidence" rating for question 5. In relation to Question 6, (b) (3), (b) (4) received a "High Confidence" rating. (b) (3), (b) (4) was asked to address how it would go about evaluating complex technical concepts and translating them in an understandable way to a non-technical audience. One thing that stood out to the evaluation team was (b) (3), (b) (4) example of how it helps stakeholders tell their own story and defend their own work by providing live demos. They also emphasized how they use visual artifacts to cut through technical concepts. Overall, (b) (3), (b) (4) received a "High Confidence" rating for question 6.

Lastly, for question 7, (b) (3), (b) (4) was asked a custom question relative to its quote. For question 7, (b) (3), (b) (4) was asked to clarify parts of its Phase 1 narrative, simply

put, many of the project narratives it presented stated (b) (3), (b) (4) advocates for open-source, but was limited by quoter request". GSA requested NAVA explain how they would advocate for open-source development for the Government. (b) (3), (b) (4) received all "Pluses" for this response, (b) (3), (b) (4) described how they would allow GSA to leverage what already exists, promote better practices within the Government team, as well as promote better software practices--people should be able to check on the code for errors and security errors. (b) (3), (b) (4) received a "High Confidence" for question 7. Based on its answers, (b) (3), (b) (4) received an overall "High Confidence" rating for Phase 2.

(b) (3), (b) (4) received an overall "Some Confidence" rating in Phase 1. Under Phase 1, (b) (3), (b) (4) received several "Pluses" in relation to the documentation presented within its source code, and a few "Minuses" for relevant experience.

(b) (3), (b) (4) source code projects demonstrated a use of indicators of project health and code quality, good documentation within the repositories observed. However, they also failed to show that they conducted Test on any of the non-18F related projects. (b) (3), (b) (4) addressed the required functional areas however, there were several "Minuses" of note. For example, (b) (3), (b) (4) team structure was confusing to the technical evaluation team, (b) (3), (b) (4) presented several different combinations of teams without much explanation. Another example found was that the site deliverable presented, was not presented in a

way that will meet the Government's standards. (b) (3), (b) (4) received an overall "Some Confidence" rating for relevant experience.

In terms of Staffing Approach, (b) (3), (b) (4) was not very clear in terms of how long it takes to onboard personnel, there was a decent emphasis on their candidate database, as well as how they are currently sustaining another performance based contract and working multiple engagements. As there wasn't a ton of detail in its staffing plan, the Government's overall confidence in the quoter's

abilities were lowered, resulting in (b) (3), (b) (4) receiving an overall “Some Confidence” rating for its staffing approach.

Lastly, the Usability Research Approach, (b) (3), (b) (4) response had a couple minuses. The plan had some well thought out descriptors, it also tied its various methods together effectively. However, (b) (3), (b) (4) added in artificial intelligence to the research process without a clear reason why and they also made the assumption that disaster victims will have ready access to technology (social media, email). (b) (3), (b) (4) received an overall “Some Confidence” rating for its usability research approach. (b) (3), (b) (4) received an overall “Some Confidence” rating for Phase 1 with three “Some Confidence” ratings in all three of the evaluation criteria.

In Phase 2 for oral interviews, (b) (3), (b) (4) was asked to prepare for seven (7) questions as part of the oral interview. All questions and the interview agenda were submitted in advance to (b) (3), (b) (4). The seventh question was relative to its quote.

For the first question, (b) (3), (b) (4) was asked how it would ensure that they have staff ready for multi-phase projects. As well as what their approach would be to staff these projects in the event that they did not have the staff currently on-hand.

(b) (3), (b) (4) answers contained some “Pluses” in relation to this question, but the biggest concern found by the Government was that (b) (3), (b) (4) answer was unclear in some parts, particularly when it came to teaming. (b) (3), (b) (4) stated they will be teaming with other partners but they did not specify with who. (b) (3), (b) (4) received an overall “Some Confidence” rating for question 1. Question 2, (b) (3), (b) (4) was asked what its approach would be for identifying the proper roles for a project and for staffing those roles. For this question (b) (3), (b) (4) received 31 of 44

General Services Administration Technology Transformation Services  
**PROCUREMENT SENSITIVE INFORMATION - CONFIDENTIAL - DO NOT PUBLISH**

several “Pluses” relating to how it will get developers and maintaining agility. However, some parts of their response was unclear. (b) (3), (b) (4) specifically they made broad statements in terms of having highly-skilled staff and creating a lean/agile recruiting process. This statement was lacking in detail and confusing

to the evaluation team. (b) (3), (b) (4) received a “Some” Confidence rating for question 2.

Question 3, (b) (3), (b) (4) was asked how it would design a research approach to determine if a project is viable. (b) (3), (b) (4) did not provide a very strong response, on some degree, they approached an iterative process, but failed to address the question of viability. They also spoke a lot about focus group use cases, but they were not entirely clear as to whether their approach included user interviews as well. There were notable “Pluses” such as how they explained how they come up with a roadmap for user research and start with questioning what data is available. Overall there were a few concerns based on the answers provided for question 3, resulting in a rating of “Some Confidence”.

In relation to the 4th question, (b) (3), (b) (4) was asked about their approach to cross functional teams. (b) (3), (b) (4) emphasized a focus on DevOps roles, finding passionate people, rotating roles among a group, and utilizing subject matter experts to supplement some skillsets. (b) (3), (b) (4) had a really strong response to this question, and in turn was given an overall rating of “High Confidence” rating for this question.

For Question 5, (b) (3), (b) (4) had to address how it intends on finding partners in the federal government in order to use and test prototypes. (b) (3), (b) (4) did not have a very strong response to this question. First, they were unclear with some of their talking points, which were confusing to the evaluation team. Their answers also indicated that they focused more on the technical aspects of scaling rather than working with more partners. Lastly, (b) (3), (b) (4) stated they mostly work with commercial entities in this regard, but did not explain how this ties into finding agency partners. (b) (3), (b) (4) received a “Low Confidence rating for question 5 overall. Question 6, (b) (3), (b) (4) received a “Some Confidence” rating. (b) (3), (b) (4) received varying “Pluses”, “Minuses”, and some neutrals for this question. One of the biggest issues the evaluation team had with this question was when they were asked about how they intended on presenting information to non-technical personnel. (b) (3), (b) (4) presented GSA with a highly complex diagram and white papers that were not ideal for the non-technical 10x environment. (b) (3), (b) (4) did

Administration Technology Transformation Services  
**PROCUREMENT SENSITIVE INFORMATION - CONFIDENTIAL - DO NOT PUBLISH**

received some pluses in terms of how they try to collaborate daily. Overall their answer, lowered the Government's confidence in terms of (b) (3), (b) (4) approach to the process of evaluating complex technical concepts and translating them to a non-technical audience.

Lastly, for question 7, (b) (3), (b) (4) was asked a custom question relative to its quote. For question 7, (b) (3), (b) (4) was asked to discuss its experience with NCI and OSI. (b) (3), (b) (4) answer was very ambiguous only stated they had team with these organizations in the past. (b) (4), (b) (3), (b) (4) received a "Some Confidence" rating for question 7. Based on its answers, (b) (3), (b) (4) received an overall "Some Confidence" rating for Phase 2.

(b) (3), (b) (4) received an overall "Some Confidence" rating in Phase 1, (b) (3) did not provide access to 1/2 repositories for relevant experience. There were several notable "Minuses" such as none of the examples provided appeared to have been performed by (b) (3), (b) (4) appeared to have addressed the appropriate amount of functional project areas. However, its project narratives didn't appear to align with the commit history in the repositories, which was stated in the RFQ. There were some "Pluses" such as they utilize quick turnaround times and prototyping and their experience with legacy transformation on IT Dashboards. (b) (3) one received an overall "Some Confidence" rating for relevant experience.

In terms of Staffing Approach, (b) (3), (b) (4) demonstrated lots of experience working with government agencies on BPA's. (b) (3), (b) (4) went into great detail in regards to how they employ 140 people who work across various disciplines and have had experience working on BPA call orders in the past. (b) (3), (b) (4) also highlighted the fact that they have been established as one of the "best places to work". With no "minuses" in relation to staffing approach (b) (3), (b) (4) received an overall "High Confidence" rating for its staffing approach.

Lastly, the Usability Research Approach, (b) (3), (b) (4) response had all "Minuses". The plan made no mention of testing, prototyping, or iterating, the plan was not particularly focused on the actual users, and the recruitment strategy presented was reliant on sources beyond their control. (b) (3), (b) (4) received an overall "Low

Confidence” rating for its usability research approach. (b) (3) received an overall “Some Confidence” rating for Phase 1 with one “Some Confidence” rating, a

33 of 44 General Services

Administration Technology Transformation Services

**PROCUREMENT SENSITIVE INFORMATION - CONFIDENTIAL - DO NOT PUBLISH**

“High Confidence” rating, and one “Low Confidence” rating for the three evaluation criteria.

In Phase 2 for oral interviews, (b) (3) was asked to prepare for seven (7) questions as part of the oral interview. All questions and the interview agenda were submitted in advance to (b) (3). The seventh question was relative to its quote.

For the first question, (b) (3) was asked how it would ensure that they have staff ready for multi-phase projects. As well as what their approach would be to staff these projects in the event that they did not have the staff currently on-hand.

(b) (3), (b) (4) answers contained several “Pluses” in relation to this question, but the biggest concern found by the Government was that (b) (3), (b) (4) answer was too focused on hiring and not on strategy for existing personnel or on its staffing approach, resulting in an overall “Some Confidence” rating for question 1. Question 2, (b) (3) was asked what its approach would be for identifying the proper roles for a project and for staffing those roles. For this question, (b) (3) only received neutrals as they only discussed their approach to Sprint 0 without much further detail. (b) (3) received a “Some” Confidence rating for question 2.

Question 3, (b) (3) was asked how it would design a research approach to determine if a project is viable. (b) (3), (b) (4) answer indicated that it would ask the right questions, however one key issue in this response involved the examples provided. The examples were not in alignment with how 10x works or what they are trying to achieve. The government had issues on how they responded. Based on the answers provided, (b) (3) received a rating of “Some Confidence”



for questions 3.

In relation to the 4th question, (b) (3) was asked about their approach to cross functional teams. A major concern was that (b) (3) stated cross-functional teams are not the default and not always right for everything. The 10x team heavily relies on cross functionality. (b) (3) did however do a good job of describing their passion for flexibility and went into detail in regards to how they collaborate using guilds. As some parts of (b) (3), (b) (3), (b) (4) response were a bit concerning, especially the part about not always utilizing cross functional teams, the evaluation team, rated (b) (3) with a “Some Confidence” rating for question 4.

34 of 44 General Services

Administration Technology Transformation Services

**PROCUREMENT SENSITIVE INFORMATION - CONFIDENTIAL - DO NOT PUBLISH**

For Question 5, (b) (3) had to address how it intends on finding partners in the federal government in order to use and test prototypes. (b) (3), (b) (4) responses received all “Pluses”. (b) (3) has a very strong response to this question going into great detail how they work on shared services all the time and usually begin as small projects that can then scale. They also explained how they purposefully selected projects in their proposal that show scale. They also were clear how they build in an open environment. (b) (3) received a “High Confidence” rating for question 5 overall. Question 6, (b) (3) received a “Low Confidence” rating. (b) (3) received mostly neutral ratings and minuses with only one “Plus” for this question. When talking about explaining technical information to non-technical groups, (b) (3) presented a very complex spreadsheet to GSA. This did not instill confidence in the evaluation team or CO in regards to (b) (3), (b) (4) ability to do this. (b) (3) received an overall “Low Confidence” rating.

Lastly, for question 7, (b) (3) was asked a custom question relative to its quote. For question 7, (b) (3) was asked to clarify where its repository went and why it was not public. (b) (3) failed to clarify any of the details of what happened to its repository nor could it confirm it was a public repository to begin with. Based on its answers, (b) (3) received an overall “Low Confidence” rating for Phase 2.

(b) (3), (b) (4) received an overall “High Confidence” rating in Phase 1. Under Phase 1, (b) (3), (b) (4) received several “Pluses” for relevant experience. (b) (3), (b) (4) provided source code projects that was well documented, high quality, and well-written code. (b) (3), (b) (4) received an overall “High Confidence” rating for relevant experience.

In terms of Staffing Approach, (b) (3), (b) (4) did not lay out a clear map of responsibility if awarded the contract. They discussed many partners but did not clarify who would take the lead in relation to the procurement if they were awarded the BPA. (b) (3), (b) (4) also listed a very minimal list of personnel currently on staff. This made the Government concerned the contractor will not be able to ramp up its staff in time when award is made and call orders are needed. With a lack of detail and some concerning items of note, (b) (3), (b) (4) receiving an overall “Some Confidence” rating for its staffing approach.

Lastly, the Usability Research Approach in (b) (3), (b) (4) response had several “Pluses” but also a concerning “Minus”. In the plan (b) (3), (b) (4) presented a 35 of

44

General Services Administration Technology Transformation Services  
**PROCUREMENT SENSITIVE INFORMATION - CONFIDENTIAL - DO NOT PUBLISH**

simple hypothesis and they didn’t focus on just one solution. Another positive attribute was that they use acceptance criteria to maintain consistency. However, one glaring negative issue found in the plan was that they stated they would use some less-effective techniques such as focus groups, which is not in alignment with what 10x is looking for in regards to this procurement. Therefore (b) (3), (b) (4) received a “Some Confidence” rating for usability research approach. (b) (3), (b) (4) received an overall “Some Confidence” rating for Phase 1 with “High Confidence” in two out of the three evaluation criteria.

In Phase 2 for oral interviews, (b) (3), (b) (4) was asked to prepare for seven (7) questions as part of the oral interview. All questions and the interview agenda were submitted in advance to (b) (3), (b) (4). The seventh question was relative to its quote.

For the first question, (b) (3), (b) (4) was asked how it would ensure that they have staff ready for multi-phase projects. As well as what their approach would be to staff these projects in the event that they did not have the staff currently on-hand. (b) (3), (b) (4) answers contained all “Pluses” in relation to this question, resulting in an overall “High Confidence” rating for question 1. (b) (3), (b) (4) provide significant detail in terms of their partnerships with other firms which give them a lot of staffing flexibility. They also described how they can surge support and have a bench of partners to pull from. Based on these responses, (b) (3), (b) (4) received an overall “High Confidence” rating. Question 2, (b) (3), (b) (4) was asked what its approach would be for identifying the proper roles for a project and for staffing those roles. For this question (b) (3), (b) (4) received several “Pluses” but also seemed to be getting to technical which came across confusing to the evaluation panel. This lowered the Government’s overall confidence. (b) (3), (b) (4) received a “Some” Confidence rating for question 2.

Question 3, (b) (3), (b) (4) was asked how it would design a research approach to determine if a project is viable. (b) (3), (b) (4) provided a strong response, specifying how they conduct stakeholder reviews, an emphasis on finding pain points, and gauging the support from the user community. Overall they received all pluses for question 3, resulting in a rating of “High Confidence”.

In relation to the 4th question, (b) (3), (b) (4) was asked about their approach to cross functional teams. (b) (3), (b) (4) emphasized a focus on team chemistry,

emphasized self-organization and not micro-management. They also provided a good example detailing how they worked on e-QIP. In this example they described how they had developers make sprint demonstration videos that also served as progress reports. They also had the project manager write unit tests when developers were busy with other work. These responses were a strong example of how (b) (3), (b) (4) would approach cross-functionality. (b) (3), (b) (4) received a “High Confidence” rating for question 4.

For Question 5, (b) (3), (b) (4) had to address how it intends on finding partners in the federal government in order to use and test prototypes. (b) (3), (b) (4) was lacking in some of its responses leaving the Government wanting more detail. They did do a good job however in terms of describing how they'll recruit participants as well as their working relationships with entities in government and the commercial marketplace. Evaluators felt responses to question 5 warranted a "Some Confidence" rating overall for it. Question 6, TrueTadnem received a "Some Confidence" rating. (b) (3), (b) (4) did not offer up a cohesive approach in regards to explaining complex technical information to a non-technical audience. They did however use good visuals and broke down the conversation in relation to the key functional areas.

Lastly, for question 7, (b) (3), (b) (4) was asked a custom question relative to its quote. For question 7, (b) (3), (b) (4) was asked to discuss the history and communication logistics of the staffing arrangements of the various company partners. (b) (3), (b) (4) described how it really emphasizes how communication happens at the program level and they care more about what team they are on versus where that particular individual is located. They also went into great detail about their management style which was greatly in tune with what GSA is looking for in this requirement. (b) (3), (b) (4) received a "High Confidence" for question 7. Based on its answers, (b) (3), (b) (4) received an overall "High Confidence" rating for Phase 2.

**Flexion:** Flexion received an overall "High Confidence" rating in Phase 1. Under Phase 1, Flexion received all "Pluses" for relevant experience. Flexion provided really good documentation in relation to its repositories and source code submissions. There was a good demonstration of project management tools to drive agile development process. Flexion also was sure to address the requested functional areas identified in the RFQ. The evaluation team also appreciated that Flexion

went into detail about some pain points for previous projects and how it would correct those issues on future buys. Furthermore, there was a lot of detail in terms of showing it has experience working with the government and even 18F. Lastly, Flexion provided good explanations of user research and product management approaches. Flexion received an overall “High Confidence” rating for relevant experience.

In terms of Staffing Approach, Flexion had one of the strongest responses. Flexion went in detail in terms of how it intends on quickly recruiting and maintaining a workforce to meet call orders. They currently have five (5) full time recruiters on staff. Also, Flexion currently employs 90-100 professionals, with the majority of the employees aligning with the ten (10) labor categories specified in the PWS. Furthermore, they also have 3,040 subcontractors who support certain projects with specific skill sets (data science, Medicare claims data knowledge). Flexion was thorough and detailed in its staffing plan resulting in Flexion receiving an overall “High Confidence” rating for its staffing approach.

Lastly, the Usability Research Approach emphasized the importance of diversity in user recruitment, leveraging partnerships with non-governmental organizations, and mentioned the importance of testing, feedback, and iterating. However, there was one item of note in the plan that was a “Minus”. Flexion appear to not have included a solution (mobile app), it was not highlighted or obvious in the hypothesis. Flexion received an overall “Some Confidence” rating for its usability research approach. Flexion received an overall “High Confidence” rating for Phase 1 with "High Confidence" in two out of the three evaluation criteria.

In Phase 2 for oral interviews, Flexion was asked to prepare for seven (7) questions as part of the oral interview. All questions and the interview agenda were submitted in advance to Flexion. The seventh question was relative to its quote.

For the first question, Flexion was asked how it would ensure that they have staff ready for multi-phase projects. As well as what their approach would be to staff these projects in the event that they did not have the staff currently on-hand. Flexion’s answers contained majority “Pluses” and a few neutrals in

relation to this question, resulting in an overall “High Confidence” rating for question 1. Flexion discussed how it actually structured to deliver within staffing

38 of 44 General Services

Administration Technology Transformation Services

**PROCUREMENT SENSITIVE INFORMATION - CONFIDENTIAL - DO NOT PUBLISH**

constraints. They went into detail they are able to quickly staff requirements in an efficient way. Flexion also discussed how they have experience with this issue on another agile BPA. Question 2, Flexion was asked what its approach would be for identifying the proper roles for a project and for staffing those roles. For this question Flexion received all pluses for its response, resulting in an overall “High Confidence” rating for question 2. Flexion went into detail in relation they prefer to get involved with a requirement before a task order or call is even issued to figure out expectations. They also discussed how they prefer to focus on a full-stack staff work with people who like to learn. These statements are very much alignment with the culture of 10x and how it works.

Question 3, Flexion was asked how it would design a research approach to determine if a project is viable. Flexion provided a strong response, specifying how they like to focus on stakeholder research, question what is the goal, and if technology is the right way to solve the problem. These answers are also very much in alignment with 10x and how it works. Overall there were all pluses for question 3, resulting in a rating of “High Confidence” for question 3.

In relation to the 4th question, Flexion was asked about their approach to cross functional teams. Flexion emphasized a focus on pairing and a strong retro process. They also talked about there is there is always a two-way dialogue in order to learn how to do small tasks so that they can contribute in different ways. These examples were a strong example of how Flexion would approach cross-functionality and meet the Government’s requirements. Flexion received a “High Confidence” rating for question 4.

For Question 5, Flexion addressed how it intends on finding partners in the federal government in order to use and test prototypes. Flexion received multiple pluses from both evaluators based on the details and examples explained.

However, there was one issue with them being unclear in terms of how partnerships in the private/non-profit sector will lead to partnerships with other federal agencies. They were a bit obscure in addressing active participation in the “community” IE code for America. This resulted in a “Some Confidence” rating for question 5. Flexion did however, go into detail how it has been working across the federal government for many years and more recently been heavily focused its experience on agile development. Flexion leverages existing partnerships, have experience with technical scale (with cloud.gov and login.gov), can provide a larger community network of digital services in and out

39 of 44 General Services

Administration Technology Transformation Services

**PROCUREMENT SENSITIVE INFORMATION - CONFIDENTIAL - DO NOT PUBLISH**

of the federal government. Question 6, Flexion received a “High Confidence” rating. Flexion was asked to address its approach to processing and presenting complex technical concepts to a non-technical audience. Flexion exclaimed how it likes to turn technical jargon into stories. They also stated they utilize psychological safety (i.e. they empower partners to speak up and say they don’t understand). Overall this is very in alignment with 10x’s culture and the way they have to conduct business in a federal environment.

Lastly, for question 7, Flexion was asked a custom question relative to its quote. For question 7, Flexion was asked the following question, “One of the project narratives your firm submitted highlighted that navigating a partner agency’s bureaucracy was the biggest challenge on the project. What strategies have you used to work effectively inside government bureaucracies?”. To address this issue, Flexion, stated they prefer to remain as flexible as possible and open to work that was never even discussed. They also made a mention in the future, it is good practice to have a stakeholder sit in on a usability test and watch users struggle to grasp the core issues. Lastly, Flexion stress how they intend on identifying even more of the obstacles which will help make the issues concrete and addressable rather than abstract. Flexion received a “High Confidence” for question 7. Based on its answers, Flexion received an overall “High Confidence” rating for Phase 2.

**Decision:** Flexion was included amongst the highest technically rated quoters. These highly rated quoters received a “High Confidence” rating in both Phase 1 and Phase 2. Overall, in relation to the quoters that made it to Phase 2, Flexion was rated higher than (b) (3), (b) (4) in terms of the evaluation (they all received “Some Confidence” ratings between the two Phases).

Flexion was rated the same as three other quoters, in relation to the criteria established for Phase 1 and their evaluation of oral interviews in Phase 2. These quoters were: (b) (3), (b) (4) All four quoters received a “High Confidence” rating in both Phase 1 and Phase 2. The RFQ specifically stated, “Quoters are advised that technical evaluation factors combined are more important than price; **as Non-Price ratings become closer, price will become more important.**”

40 of 44 General Services

Administration Technology Transformation Services

**PROCUREMENT SENSITIVE INFORMATION - CONFIDENTIAL - DO NOT PUBLISH**

Overall, Flexion had superior ratings in relation to all non-price factors in comparison to the seven (7) other quoters that received a “Some Confidence” ratings in both Phase 1 and Phase 2. However, Flexion was essentially equal to the other three quoters with a “High Confidence” rating in relation to Phase 2 (b) (3), (b) (4). Therefore, price became more important in regards to the final determination for award. The CO’s final decision came down to considering the highest rated quoters AND their respective pricing, inclusive of discounts. Out of the highest rated quotes (“High Confidence” overall), Flexion provided the Government with the lowest price and the best discount. The Government has considered the pricing of the lower rated quoters that made it to Phase 2, however there was no significant price trade-off to warrant an award to a quoter with a lower rating than Flexion. Flexion’s superior technical rating as well as it having the best price out of the highest rated quoters, justifies the decision to award to this firm. Flexion’s expertise will result in cost(s) saving over the lifetime of the BPA by advising the Government on key issues, pain points,



and provide savings in regards to process improvement. Flexion represents the best value to the Government considering tradeoffs between non-price and price related factors.

## F. The price reasonableness determination

GSA has found the pricing submitted by Flexion Inc. to be fair and reasonable compared to the Independent Government Cost Estimate (IGCE), and Comparison of proposed prices received in response to the solicitation. As discussed, this procurement is a BPA and quoters were required to submit labor rate prices for future call orders. However, quoters were also required to complete an example pricing page in which the Government included some examples of labor hours to get a general idea of the quoter's price. The example pricing page was used to conduct a general comparison of prices amongst quotes and made a differentiation between best price. The total example price submitted by Flexion came to (b) (4) with option years.

As stated above, price was evaluated separately by evaluating the labor rate pricing provided by each quoter. To compare the costs of the labor rates, the GSA utilized the example pricing tab in the pricing sheet (Attachment B). The anticipated total cost for the base year and each of the four one-year option years were then summed by calculating the hours filled in by the GSA Contracting Officer, which was 100 hours for each labor category. Pricing

41 of 44 General Services

Administration Technology Transformation Services

**PROCUREMENT SENSITIVE INFORMATION - CONFIDENTIAL - DO NOT PUBLISH**

observed included the labor rate pricing and discounts proposed by each quoter.

(b) (3), had the highest pricing in relation to the example pricing sheet at (b) (3), (b) (4). (b) (3), (b) (4) was the second highest quoter at (b) (4), (b) (3) followed by (b) (3), (b) (4) at (b) (3), (b) (4), then (b) (3), (b) (4) at (b) (3), (b) (4), (b) (3), (b) (4) at (b) (4), (b) (3), Flexion at (b) (4), (b) (3), (b) (3), (b) (4) at (b) (4), (b) (3), (b) (3), (b) (4).

at (b) (4), (b) (3) , (b) (3), (b) (4) at (b) (4), (b) (3) , (b) (3), (b) (4) at (b) (4), (b) (3) , and finally (b) (3), (b) (4) at (b) (4), (b) (3) Overall, Flexion had the best price out of all the highest rated quotes. All of the quoters with a better price than Flexion had a lower technical non-price rating. Overall, considering price and non-price factors, Flexion represents the best value to the Government and in comparison to the other quotes submitted, Flexion has submitted a fair and reasonable price.

The hourly rates are determined to be fair and reasonable, and are consistent with the rates offered under Flexion's Federal Supply Schedule contract. The Contractor's level of effort will be evaluated before each call is issued under the BPA.

## **G. Rationale for using other than FFP or performance based (if applicable)**

This BPA will be performance based, however it will contain both Firm Fixed price and Labor Hour type call orders. The requirements of this BPA are not fully appropriate for all Firm-Fixed-Price (FFP) call orders because the need for development, design and research, support services will depend on the Agile development practices implemented at the call order level. TTS's needs may fluctuate based on customer needs and other business needs throughout the organization.

The BPA will utilize agile planning and development processes in which services will mostly be exploratory in nature with the possibility of creating a firm fixed price call order for a fully developed product. Therefore, TTS cannot provide an accurate estimate for development, design and research for all future call orders at the time of putting this BPA in place. TTS can neither provide the anticipated costs with any reasonable degree of confidence. However, this will be assessed

and scrutinized at the individual call order level with an emphasis on awarding FFP call orders when appropriate. Additionally, the appropriate contract type justifications will be documented and approved at the call order level.

## **H. When an order exceeds the simplified acquisition threshold, evidence of compliance with the ordering procedures at 8.405-2.**

- a. The GSA provided the RFQ, including the performance work statement and evaluation criteria (i.e., relevant experience, staffing approach, and usability research approach), to schedule contractors that offer services that will meet the needs of the customer Agency.
- b. This BPA is being established on a competitive basis. GSA provided the RFQ, which included the performance work statement and evaluation criteria, to as many schedule contractors as practicable, consistent with the market research conducted. GSA had a reasonable expectation that it would receive quotes from at least three contractors that can fulfill the requirements. GSA received twenty-six (26) quotes in response to the requirement.
- c. In accordance with FAR 8.405-4, the Contracting Officer requested that the Contractors provide any additional price reduction when the solicitation was released on March 28, 2019. The Contractors responded on April 22, 2019. Flexion's submission reflected its best price and included an acceptable Government discount for the requested services.

## **Fundin**

### **g**

Funding for this action will be provided and approved at the call order level, therefore there is no PR associated with the procurement currently.

# Eligibilit

y

A check of the System for Award Management (SAM) dated August 12, 2019 shows Flexion, DUNS # 079394394, is Active as a Small Business, not on any suspended and/or debarred lists, and does not have any exclusions.

43 of 44 General Services

Administration Technology Transformation Services

**PROCUREMENT SENSITIVE INFORMATION - CONFIDENTIAL - DO NOT PUBLISH**

# Conclusio

n

Based on a thorough assessment of the non-price and price evaluation, it is determined that Flexion Inc. is eligible for award and provides the best value to the government at a fair and reasonable price. Therefore, it is in the best interest of the government to award a single-award Blanket Purchasing Agreement (BPA) to Flexion Inc. at the evaluated labor rates inclusive of Option years.

\_\_\_\_ Joseph Dorsey, GSA TTS Contracting  
Officer

\_\_\_\_ Date

e-Signed by Joseph Dorsey on 2019-08-19

